



**Dominican Scholar**

---

The Global Education Office | Staff  
Scholarship

The Global Education Office (GEO)

---

2018

## Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Comprehensive Internationalization in Higher Education

Kati Bell

*Dominican University of California, [kati.bell@dominican.edu](mailto:kati.bell@dominican.edu)*

Jennifer Donaghue

*George Washington University*

Andrew Gordon

*Diversity Abroad*

**Survey: Let us know how this paper benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Bell, Kati; Donaghue, Jennifer; and Gordon, Andrew, "Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Comprehensive Internationalization in Higher Education" (2018). *The Global Education Office | Staff Scholarship*. 2.

<https://scholar.dominican.edu/geo-staff/2>

This White Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the The Global Education Office (GEO) at Dominican Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Global Education Office | Staff Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Dominican Scholar. For more information, please contact [michael.pujals@dominican.edu](mailto:michael.pujals@dominican.edu).

# COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP:



## Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Comprehensive Internationalization in Higher Education

By: KATI BELL  
JENNIFER DONAGHUE  
ANDREW GORDON

Foreword by: WILLIAM B. HARVEY





## **Diversity Abroad**

Diversity Abroad® is a registered trademark.

1731 Delaware Street, Suite 100

Berkeley, CA 94703

+1 510-982-0635 ext. 704

[diversitynetwork.org](http://diversitynetwork.org)

[members@diversityabroad.org](mailto:members@diversityabroad.org)

**Copyright © 2018 by Diversity Abroad. All rights reserved.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 4 ABOUT

## 6 TESTIMONIALS

## 8 FOREWORD BY WILLIAM B. HARVEY

## 11 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

## 13 HISTORICAL BARRIERS TO CDO/SIO PARTNERSHIPS

## 15 POTENTIAL POSITIVE OUTCOMES FROM CDO/SIO ALLIANCE

### BRIDGING THE GAP: CHIEF DIVERSITY OFFICER /

## 15 SENIOR INTERNATIONAL OFFICER STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP FORUM

### 17 Diversifying Staff and Faculty

### 18 Campus Climate

### 19 Student Academic Success

### 20 International Student Engagement

### 21 Equitable Access to Education Abroad

### 22 Internationalizing the Curriculum

## 23 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 24 GLOSSARY AND REFERENCES

## 26 AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

# ABOUT

## WHO WE ARE

Diversity Abroad is the leading membership consortium of over 270 educational institutions, government agencies, for-profit and non-profit organizations that are committed to advancing policies and practices that increase access and foster diversity, equity & inclusion in global education and cultural exchanges.

## OUR MISSION

To create equitable access to the benefits of global education by empowering educators, engaging stakeholders, and connecting diverse students to resources and opportunity.

## ABOUT THE STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP FORUM

Diversity Abroad's Strategic Leadership Forum convenes an intimate cohort of Chief Diversity Officers and Senior International Officers to examine best practices for strategic collaboration as higher education institutions tackle the challenges and opportunities of both campus internationalization and diversity, equity, and inclusion goals.

# 2018 INAUGURAL CDO/SIO LEADERSHIP FORUM PARTICIPANTS

Diversity Abroad thanks the Chief Diversity Officers and Senior International Officers from the following institutions for their contributions to the inaugural CDO & SIO Strategic Leadership Forum.

AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

BABSON COLLEGE

BROWN UNIVERSITY

CASE WESTERN RESERVE  
UNIVERSITY

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND

DOMINICAN UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA

DREXEL UNIVERSITY

EMERSON COLLEGE

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL  
UNIVERSITY

HENDRIX COLLEGE

MIAMI UNIVERSITY

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE  
UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

SPELMAN COLLEGE

TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY

UNC CHARLOTTE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT  
CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA

UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS

# TESTIMONIALS



**DR. ARTIKA R. TYNER, ED.D., M.P.P., J.D.**

Associate Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion  
University of Saint Thomas



The Strategic Leadership Forum provided me with new tools which I have leveraged to develop our institutional goals related to diversity, equity, inclusion and internationalization, create an implementation process, and monitor our progress.



**PETER L. GESS, PhD**

Director of International Programs  
Hendrix College



Diversity and inclusion are much discussed topics at many international education conferences, and rightly so. Importantly, bringing together SIOs and chief diversity officers at the Strategic Leadership Forum moved us beyond discussion about the *value* of inclusion, to *strategies* about how to increase participation. My colleague and I left with concrete plans which we have been able to implement on the Hendrix campus.



### SHELLEY STEPHENSON, PhD

Senior Director of International and Special Initiatives  
Arizona State University



The 2018 CDO/SIO Leadership Forum was one of those rare opportunities to share and learn across the university functional boundaries that – despite the best of intentions – tend to separate us on a daily basis. I attended the Strategic Leadership Forum along with my institution's CDO, and our common experience there jump-started some conversations that are probably long overdue.



### MARILYN SANDERS MOBLEY, PhD

Vice President for the Office for Inclusion, Diversity & Equal Opportunity  
Case Western Reserve University



The opportunity for Chief Diversity Officers and Senior International Officers from around the country to meet in the same space, compare notes, practices, and policies, and engage in meaningful dialogue about how we can enhance our work was an important outcome of the conference! As the world becomes more complicated, the leadership of CDOs and SIOs will become even more critical and will need to be even more informed, nuanced, and responsive to the needs of our students.



# FOREWORD

By William B. Harvey

Not very many people, including those in the academy, grasped the significance and implications of the term *global village* when the visionary futurist Marshall McLuhan popularized this phrase in the mid-20th century. Political, economic, and cultural demarcations were used to divide the planet into three distinct categories, designated as the first, second, and third worlds. Placement within the categories depended on the determinants of material production and consumption, along with the perception of individual and group access to political processes and media sources.

During that period, America proudly extolled its position as the foundation of the “first world,” but the civil rights movement burst the bubble of delusion created by the country’s egalitarian posturing. It also exposed the structural role of colleges and universities in maintaining a society where the social practices were contradictory to the articulated philosophical values of liberty, justice, and equality. Postsecondary education, reflecting the larger society in which it was embedded, was delivered at institutions that were clearly separate and unequal.

Now, at this point in our contemporary, technocratic world, the push for diversity and inclusion within the academy has, in some ways, merged with the reality of globalism. This confluence offers colleges and universities opportunities to push the social dynamic

forward, into an era in which individuals and groups who are *not* a part of the majority population receive equitable treatment and a comparable measure of dignity and respect, both on and beyond the campuses.

Into this dynamic milieu, the chief diversity officer (CDO) and the senior international officer (SIO) could possibly emerge as the two administrative figures who may be best positioned to help their institutions design and implement policies and practices that translate their lofty ideals into specific actions. Created and maintained first and foremost as learning institutions, colleges and universities quite naturally intend to provide optimum environments for their students to learn, grow, and develop to their fullest potential. A tsunami of evidence provides documentation that diverse populations in the classroom enhance

the educational experiences for **all** students. So, the CDO and SIO are suited to become agents for institutional enhancement. They can help elevate the intellectual ethos of their college or university through the inclusion and empowerment of people from various backgrounds and perspectives who have been included only marginally, if at all, in the previous development and operation of their institutions.

There is a tinge of irony to the prospect that two individuals whose positions are likely to have them placed on the margins of the academic enterprise could now play an important role in crafting the central direction of their institutions. But perhaps the reality of changing demographics within the country, and the recognition of an interconnected international community—McLuhan's global village—will help the change-averse academic enterprise to be responsive to these larger forces. The CDO and SIO must be encouraged to provide the guidance and input that will help their institutions become intentionally diverse, inclusive, and welcoming to individuals from the entire spectrum of races, religions, cultures, lifestyles, perspectives, outlooks, and orientations. If so, then the individuals who enter the institutions, be they students, faculty, or administrators and staff, as well as the policies and practices that determine the course of actions within these environments, will become reflective of the times and circumstances in which we live. Special emphasis should be placed on increasing representation from groups or communities where previous prejudicial and discriminatory

practices have historically limited or excluded their participation in these hallowed settings.

Especially in the current turbulent political climate, the CDO and the SIO, and the colleges and universities that employ them, must see their roles as being complementary, rather than competitive. Intentional, directed activities that are designed to bring students and academic professionals from the underserved and underrepresented African American and Latinx communities into the institutions must not be compromised by programmatic efforts to increase the international presence on campus, which is also a valid and valued endeavor. Even as each institution determines its own individualized conception of how diversity is operationalized within its space, it is neither reasonable nor appropriate to use the enrollment of students from other countries as a substitution or replacement for the inclusion of people from this nation's racial and cultural minority groups. Intentional exposure to, and interaction with, individuals who are different from ourselves creates opportunities to review, challenge, modify, or reaffirm the ideas and concepts that we bring to the engagement process. Postsecondary institutions have a responsibility to initiate and coordinate such formal and informal learning experiences with both domestic and international participants.

The realization of global interdependence becomes more evident with each passing day, and it may be worthwhile to consider a change in terminology so that what is commonly known as “study abroad” is instead

identified as *global experience*. The architects of these experiences realize that, without exception, both personal and professional growth take place in the participants, whether they are students or academic professionals. But the case for participation should be easier to understand for both students and parents, especially for those who are the first in their families to attend college. Providing clearer ties to relevant content in specific courses, as well as enhanced employment prospects after graduation, helps validate the experience. Collaborative efforts between the CDO and SIO could lead to suggestions being presented within their institutions to consider modifications in such areas as financial assistance, curricular offerings, and credit assignment that might increase the participation of students from underrepresented groups, because these opportunities should be made available not just to those who are socially privileged, but to every student who is interested in embracing them.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion are key components of strategic planning in higher education and provide an opportunity to combine the inclusion initiatives that are rooted in the civil rights era with campus internationalization efforts of the more recent period. The Diversity Abroad CDO/SIO Strategic Leadership Forum (SLF) is the optimum setting for individuals who hold these leadership positions to discuss and push forward an agenda that supports intentional collaboration between their respective areas of interest and responsibility by exploring six strategic

areas for collaboration: diversifying staff and faculty, campus climate (the faculty/staff/student sense of belonging), student academic success, international student engagement, increased access to education abroad, and internationalizing the curriculum. The evolving combined impact of diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in conjunction with campus internationalization will be significant and undeniable to higher education and the larger society.



# INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

**A**s globalization continues to create a more interconnected world community, comprehensive internationalization initiatives are growing significantly in size and scope within higher education institutions around the country. It was recently reported in ACE's Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses that 72% of survey respondents indicated campus internationalization initiatives have accelerated since 2016's Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses Survey (Brajkovic & Helms, 2018). Most comprehensive internationalization policies are part of a university strategic plan that are centrally developed and implemented under the guidance of the senior international officer (SIO) with the goal of creating a more globally aware campus community. These policies commonly cover three primary areas: increasing international student enrollment, expanding study abroad participation, and internationalizing the curriculum. As the implementation of these types of internationalization policies increase, concerns regarding the impact of these policies on campus diversity, equity, and inclusion are growing.

Similar to comprehensive internationalization, diversity and inclusion are highly visible key components of strategic planning in higher

education today. At many campuses diversity and inclusion offices are led by the chief diversity officer (CDO) and prioritize increasing access, fostering opportunity, and improving outcomes for all students, but especially for underserved populations, with the goal to achieve a more diverse and inclusive university community. Additionally, the CDO works closely to align diversity hiring goals for the university staff and faculty as well as assessing and reporting on the state of the campus climate. Viewed side by side both internationalization and diversity initiatives strive to achieve very similar goals, e.g. promoting a variety of cultural and social perspectives, through organized activities, programs and practices, to create an inclusive community while cultivating a campus climate that fosters openness and understanding toward all people.

Diversity, equity, and internationalization aren't typically terms that are put together in higher education, but recurring equity themes around access, opportunity, and outcomes demonstrate a concern for those to whom internationalization policies and programs serve and do not serve. At the same time, there is growing sentiment that diversity and inclusion should also be viewed from both global and local perspectives (Mobley & Fleshler, 2015).



**Both internationalization and multicultural education fields seek to help students comprehend the significance of human diversity, while at the same time addressing underlying commonalities, be they global or national (Cortés, 1998, p. 117).**

Currently, the understanding and articulation of diversity, equity, inclusion, and internationalization terminology in higher education is often incomplete and, in some cases, misused by administration, faculty, and students. This lack of shared understanding may create apprehension, misunderstanding, and even resistance to campus initiatives in both diversity and international areas. For example, the terms globalization and internationalization are often used interchangeably despite having very different meanings and implications. Additionally, defining the concept of equity is challenging for many and is frequently interchanged with equality. Diversity is, at present, a very commonly used term but often narrowly understood to only reference the racial/ethnic composition of a group, and overlooking gender, religion, sexual orientation, age, class, and physical ability. Recently, inclusion has become a common descriptor in the diversity and equity lexicon. It tends to hold significant power due to its fairly straightforward meaning and application. It is important to note that both diversity and inclusion are terms that describe an outcome that can be quantifiably

measured through data checks and climate surveys. Equity, in contrast, is not an outcome, but a practice and/or set of policies intentionally employed to provide access and opportunity to all stakeholders.

Given the weight and influence of these terms, it is of great value to present definitions that originate from education research literature and from which shared understanding and use can continue.

**INTERNATIONALIZATION:** a series of agreed-upon practices around the common campus goal of creating a more globally connected student and faculty body (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

**GLOBALIZATION:** an economic phenomenon involving the increasing the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across borders (Knight & de Wit, 1995).

**EDUCATIONAL EQUITY:** the provision of equal access, opportunity, and outcome for all students and faculty (Bensimon, Rueda, Dowd, & Harris, 2007).

**DIVERSITY:** the inclusion of a compositional difference of people as defined by ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic criteria (McGee-Banks & Banks, 1995).

**INCLUSION:** the extent to which individuals can access information and resources, are involved in work groups, and have the ability to influence decision-making processes (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998).

# HISTORICAL BARRIERS TO CDO/SIO PARTNERSHIPS

**D**espite the shared fundamental ideology of creating and modeling a campus community centered on comfort with difference and providing equitable opportunities, diversity and international offices have historically worked in isolation of each other. Several factors contribute to this disconnect, both in perception and in reality, between the areas of responsibility of the chief diversity officer and the senior international officer. The following factors bring to light some of the fundamental differences in scale and scope of the populations being served and the set office objectives of the international and diversity office. The CDO has primarily focused on the diversity and inclusion of the domestic community within the borders of the US. The diversity and inclusion office mission has roots from the educational and social reform movements in the US during the 1960s and '70s. A large component of its mission serves a population often marginalized from the larger campus community. The CDO frequently comes into the position from the faculty ranks and is responsible for an organization perceived to be co-curricular in nature. Finally, the CDO manages a campus organizational unit that has historically been seen by some to be subtractive and costly, and the students primarily served may be seen as marginalized and at risk.

In contrast, the SIO's priority lies with the mobility of students, staff, and faculty through international affiliations and global partnerships. Internationalization in education is often traced back to the post-World War II and Cold War era, when federal programs such as the J. William Fulbright Scholarship and the National Security Education Program (NSEP) were created to promote overseas educational exchange and language learning. Campus international offices generally include the promotion of peace and cultural understanding across borders as a primary component of their mission or vision statement. In many cases the international office is viewed primarily as an administrative campus component that generates significant revenue through international student enrollments and highly visible education abroad programs. The larger campus community may perceive students served by the SIO as privileged and affluent.

## COMPONENTS AND PERCEPTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL AND DIVERSITY OFFICES

INTERNATIONAL OFFICE	DIVERSITY/MULTICULTURAL OFFICE
<b>EXTERNAL FOCUS</b> mobility of students, faculty/staff in and out of the country, overseas institutional partnerships	<b>INTERNAL FOCUS</b> on diversity and inclusion within the campus community
<b>ROOTS FROM POST-WORLD WAR II</b> and Cold War era; academic origins in Area Studies and International Relations	<b>ROOTS FROM EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL REFORM</b> movements from the 1960s and '70s; academic
<b>INTERNATIONAL FRAME:</b> Promotion of peace and cultural understanding across borders	<b>DOMESTIC FRAME:</b> Promotion of tolerance and the elimination of social oppression within the United States
<b>PERCEPTION OF PRIVILEGE:</b> Students served by international office perceived as affluent and privileged	<b>PERCEPTION OF MARGINALIZATION:</b> Students served by diversity office perceived as marginalized and at risk



# POTENTIAL POSITIVE OUTCOMES FROM CDO/SIO ALLIANCE

International and diversity offices share similar challenges at most universities. In many cases both offices are navigating multiple mandates, resulting in an awkward straddle between administration and faculty. Despite campus-wide directives and programming CDOs and SIOs often find their offices in silos, not connected to each other or the larger campus community.

Both areas are frequently subjected to assumptions, stereotypes, and narrow definitions, as their missions and goals are not well understood or accepted by the greater campus community. This ambiguity can lead to high risks to budget and staff cuts during periods of resources allocation.

## SHARED CHALLENGES

Perceived disconnect from core university

Offices are in silos and narrowly defined

Mission and goals not always well understood by greater campus community

High risk to budget, and staff cuts during resource allocation

## BRIDGING THE GAP: CHIEF DIVERSITY OFFICER / SENIOR INTERNATIONAL OFFICER STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP FORUM

Since its inception in 2006, Diversity Abroad has been at the forefront of engaging the field in critical dialogue and advocating for practices and strategies that advance diversity, equity, and inclusive excellence within international education and cultural exchange. Through its consortium, the Diversity Abroad Network,

Diversity Abroad collaborates with over 270 higher education institutions, NGOs, service providers, and government agencies to realize a shared vision, that the next generation of college graduates from diverse and underrepresented backgrounds are equipped with the skills, knowledge, and acumen to thrive



in the 21st century interconnected world and global workforce. For this shared vision to come to fruition, it is imperative that institutions of higher education develop comprehensive strategies to increase participation of diverse students in international education and adopt the good practices and policies that support the success of students who pursue such opportunities. Further, as international students become a fixture on U.S. campuses and support global learning, it will be essential to the benefit of international students, domestic students, and the communities associated with universities-- for institutions to support a sense of belonging for international students. This requires both commitment and collaboration within the academy. As such, it is imperative for senior campus administrators, specifically Chief Diversity Officers and Senior International Officers, to be at the forefront of strategies that

create equitable access to the benefits afforded through international education.

Given its role as an organization that serves to bridge the work of international education and diversity and inclusion professionals, Diversity Abroad is uniquely positioned to develop resources and provide professional development and networking opportunities that will support intentional, strategic, and sustainable collaboration between chief diversity officers and senior international officers. The 2018 CDO & SIO Strategic Leadership Forum is but one example of Diversity Abroad's commitment to bringing senior administrators together to engage in thoughtful dialogue, challenge the status quo, and build new partnerships with a shared goal of better preparing diverse and underrepresented student for success.

The Strategic Leadership Forum examined best practices for collaboration between CDOs and SIOs that promote equitable access to the benefits afforded through campus internationalization. The think tank session of the Strategic Leadership Forum brought together CDOs and SIOs to discuss this issue in greater detail. The discussion resulted in the development of the following guidelines to be considered for embedding diversity, equity, and inclusive good practices and policies into campus internationalization. The think tank members focused on the following six strategic initiatives:

**1 DIVERSIFYING STAFF  
AND FACULTY**

**2 CAMPUS CLIMATE -  
FACULTY/STAFF/STUDENT  
SENSE OF BELONGING**

**3 STUDENT ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

**4 INTERNATIONAL STUDENT  
ENGAGEMENT**

**5 EQUITABLE ACCESS TO  
EDUCATION ABROAD**

**6 INTERNATIONALIZING THE  
CURRICULUM**

## 1 DIVERSIFYING STAFF AND FACULTY

The CDO's mandate normally involves a commitment to advancing diversity and inclusion through student programming and the hiring of faculty and staff at the institution. At some institutions diversity in this respect is defined narrowly, while for other colleges and universities a diverse workforce spans beyond US diversity and includes the hiring of international researchers, faculty, and staff. Ignoring the importance of a diverse workforce in the higher education setting can have various consequences. First, and most importantly, as the student demographic changes and becomes more ethnically, economically, and otherwise diverse, it is important to have more faculty and staff who can relate to students based on shared background and experience. Not having such a workforce can put the institution at a competitive disadvantage. Additionally, ignoring the need for a diverse workforce can impact the university profile and rankings. To be effective leaders and advocates of this work, CDOs and SIOs must come to a shared understanding of diversity within their higher education setting. They are challenged to define metrics, clarify data of international and diverse groups on campus, and establish value statements for diversifying the higher education community. These efforts can culminate in shared value statements.

The CDO and SIO can work together to establish guidelines for diversity, while

recognizing driving factors that attract the attention of leadership, such as: consequences of ignoring diversity in the competitive higher education setting, the importance of diversity in the institution's profile, and the benefits to the community of hiring foreign nationals to the faculty and staffing of higher education. Hiring practices and priorities must include statements that emphasize international engagement and inclusive pedagogies. Diverse hiring committees equipped with interview questions that are inclusive and cross-culturally competent can be incorporated into hiring practices in collaboration with human resources initiatives. Implementing these initiatives are the call to action for CDOs and SIOs expressed during the Diversity Abroad Strategic Leadership Forum.

### DIVERSIFYING STAFF AND FACULTY RECOMMENDATIONS:

**Recognize the diversity & inclusion drivers important to leadership**

**Ensure relevant diversity, inclusion and international themes are addressed in the hiring process**

**Establish hiring priorities**

## 2 CAMPUS CLIMATE

The SIO is not routinely considered in the discussion around campus climate. Yet the SIO role includes representation of international students, scholars, and faculty on the campus who are immigrants in the U.S. context, often tightly bound by the complexities of US immigration regulations. In today's increasingly stringent immigration climate, this population needs a champion that elevates their voices and needs to university leadership and ultimately to the national stage through higher education advocacy for immigration. Additionally, SIOs oversee outbound education abroad programs. As more diverse and underrepresented students pursue education abroad, there is an increased need for situational awareness as to the unique challenges diverse students face abroad due to their identity.

Shared recognition of responsibility between the SIO and CDO of this important national interest work opens additional pathways for collaboration. Through this lens of intersectionality, a statement of shared values of diversity that span the roles of both the realm of the CDO and SIO infuses a sense of belonging among diverse populations on campus, including not only faculty and staff but also students. Rather than feeling marginalized and solely in the minority, diverse communities acquire feelings of empowerment to self-identify as a person of color. Intentionally constructed and ad hoc affinity groups can and will emerge that reinforce a sense of belonging of this population in the higher education setting. The CDOs and SIOs must play a leadership role in making these intentions a reality in the higher education setting.

### CAMPUS CLIMATE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**Shared value statements**

**Empower self-identification as a person of color**

**Build affinity groups to enhance sense of belonging**

**Faculty senate collaboration**

### 3 STUDENT ACADEMIC SUCCESS

CDOs and SIOs must work together to document and highlight the impact international programs have on student academic success. Specifically, it has been documented by organizations such as AAC&U that education abroad has the potential to have a positive effect on student success, mainly GPA, time to graduation, and graduation rates (Kuh, 2008). Through identifying and publicizing the impact that high impact practices have on the communities they serve, CDOs and SIOs are positioned to collaborate to advocate for additional resources, advance student academic success and simultaneously raise the profile of each other's portfolios.

Supporting academic success extends beyond domestic students. At times, due to cultural, language, and other barriers, international students may find it challenging to fully integrate with the campus community, which can impact their academic standing and overall desire to remain at the institution. Thus, as CDOs are mandated with promoting a sense of belonging at the academy to support the success of all students, there are opportunities for collaboration with SIOs to ensure the unique needs of international students are considered.



#### STUDENT ACADEMIC SUCCESS RECOMMENDATIONS:

**Shared reporting on student success metrics for domestic & international students**

**Establish shared high-impact practices and overlap**

**Jointly approach faculty development to spur professional development around diversity and inclusion and internationalization training, including inclusive pedagogy professional development**

**Share data with many stakeholders to demonstrate successful collaborations to campus community**

**Use intercultural assessment mechanisms**

## 4 INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Higher education as a whole has experienced an increase in international student enrollment in the past decade. China, India, and South Korea continue to lead as top sending countries (IIE, 2017). In the past year, the number of international students in the US increased by 3.4% (IIE, 2017) to 1,078,822 students, infusing \$3.69 billion dollars into the US economy (NAFSA, 2017). Institutions of higher education have worked to rapidly adapt to the unique needs of international students. Simultaneously they must navigate the changing US immigration climate and balance the need for global learning and competency for student development and engagement in the workforce.

The SIO plays a central role as an advocate for the work of the university's international office and international students; however, it takes a village to holistically support international students and ensure their success. By including the campus CDO into this work, new pathways

of programmatic engagement emerge. As international students arrive in the United States, they are thrust into the racial climate of the US, rife with historical, systemic racism and current anti-immigrant sentiment. The CDO can play an important role in helping newly arrived students comprehend the unique racial setting and context of the US, how to navigate ignorance, and find allies of diversity. Further interweaving of the CDO and SIO areas includes leadership in bringing together international and domestic students of color, fostering awareness and opportunity of international exchange for US populations that are underrepresented in international education through this contact. Collaboration can happen not only on the CDO/SIO level, but also among the smaller offices that directly support these student populations. Strategy documents can help highlight and define shared goals and establish opportunities of unified advocacy and leadership.

### INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ENGAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS:

**Establish a campus-wide support network  
beyond the international services office**

**Involve the diversity office in arrival  
orientation for international students**

**Determine similar needs of international  
and domestic diverse students**

**Shared strategic document for  
collaboration with CDO/SIO**

## 5 EQUITABLE ACCESS TO EDUCATION ABROAD

Providing equitable access to education abroad for diverse students is a joint venture that spans the roles of the CDO and SIO. Education abroad experiences in the higher education setting instill transformative personal and cross-cultural growth for participants, including giving them an inherent edge in higher education retention, completion, and career attainment after graduation (IIE, 2017; Redden, 2010; Sweeney, 2013). However, one can argue that these experiences and subsequent benefits seem to be reserved for a small sub-section of the higher education community who are attracted to education abroad: white women studying subjects in the humanities (IIE, 2017; Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2015; Salisbury, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2011). Access for all students to international education remains unmet. Diverse and underrepresented groups in higher education such as students of color, students with disabilities, and those of lower socio-economic status remain stagnant in education abroad programming (IIE, 2017).

### ACCESS TO EDUCATION ABROAD RECOMMENDATIONS:

**Identify and address unique needs of diverse students related to education abroad to inspire greater participation**

**Establish targeted funding opportunities for diverse students**

**Rethink the scope of underrepresented students in education abroad to include international students and men**

**Establish an advisory committee to ensure continued work on these areas of need**

**Collaborative review of education abroad practices and policies to ensure holistic and inclusive support is provided for diverse students who pursue global programs**

## 6 INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM

Internationalization is not just education abroad. Internationalization at home is a concept that highlights international education activity that transpires on the college campus for students who will not engage education abroad, bringing international experiences to all students during their college student development experience. According to Knight (2006), internationalization at home is comprised of interdependent streams constituting a diversity of activities including curriculum and programs, teaching/learning processes, extra-curricular activities, liaison with local cultural/ethnic groups, and, research or scholarly activity. CDO and SIO collaborative work to internationalize the curriculum opens pathways of global learning for diverse students, ensuring that all students learn how to engage in a globally connected world.

Engaging and inspiring faculty participation is paramount for success in this area. General education requirements requiring coursework on global learning can ensure all students receive an international education regardless of participation in education abroad. CDOs and SIOs can partner with faculty learning centers to provide training, workshops, and suggestions on curriculum development or themes while letting faculty experts lead the building of their course curriculum. Assessment of the impact of these trainings with a focus on student learning outcomes of the internationalized curriculum is needed to inform the value of this work and inspire greater participation and buy in from senior leadership.

### INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM RECOMMENDATIONS:

**Invest in internationalization at home through faculty buy-in and intended student learning outcomes**

**Continue assessment of internationalization outcomes**

**Ensure international themes encompass the experience of diverse or marginalized groups within a specific country**

**Infuse internationalization into learning through a foreign language or global learning requirement in the curriculum**

# CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2018 Diversity Abroad Strategic Leadership Forum served to bring a large and diverse group of higher education professionals from both the international and diversity campus sectors to discuss shared challenges and potential collaborations to further embed diversity, equity, and inclusive good practices and policies into campus comprehensive internationalization. During the forum and think tank session the group established six strategic areas of focus to further inclusion and equity in the following areas: diversifying staff and faculty, campus climate, student academic success, international student engagement, access to education abroad, and internationalizing curriculum. The think tank committee made the following recommendations to further collaboration between CDOs and SIOs toward the goal of embedding diversity and equity in campus internationalization:

- 1 **Need for conversations around definitions; institution needs to define diversity in a holistic sense**
- 2 **Highlight shared values around intercultural competency shared between CDO and SIO through collaborative work and projects**
- 3 **Find incentives for leadership buy-in by finding shared CDO and SIO goals that respond to university initiatives to acquire resources and to show the value of these offices to the university, and to leadership**
- 4 **Use data-driven evidence and decision making, such as: revenue generated from international students; positive benefits of education abroad – GPA, time to completion, employability; affects rankings and potential for philanthropy and giving**
- 5 **Develop an understanding of the drivers and motivations of campus leadership. What are interests of Provost/leadership's office? How do CDOs/SIOs fit into their needs and interests?**

Internationalization, diversity, equity, and inclusion are intrinsically tied to the future of higher education. As such, Diversity Abroad will continue to support strategic collaboration between CDOs and SIOs through the sharing of best practices, development of resources, and creating opportunities for in-person networking and learning with events such as the Strategic Leadership Forum.



# GLOSSARY

**COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION** is a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions (ACE, 2018).

**DIVERSE/UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENTS:** Identity groups that have historically been marginalized or limited in accessing higher education, which generally include racial and ethnic minority groups, first-generation college students, students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, LGBTQI, and students with disabilities.

**EDUCATION ABROAD/GLOBAL PROGRAMS:** Education that takes place outside a student/participant's home country. This includes but is not limited to international study, internships, volunteer or work programs. Such programs can be credit or non-credit bearing as long as they include focused learning objectives.

**INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS:** International individuals who are in the U.S. on a temporary, student visa and who are not immigrants (permanent resident with an I-51 or Green Card), undocumented immigrants, or refugees.

# REFERENCES

- American Council on Education (2018). CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization. Retrieved from [www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx](http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx)
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
- Bensimon, E. M., Rueda, R., Dowd, A. C., & Harris III, F. (2007). Accountability, equity, and practitioner learning and change. *Metropolitan Universities*, 18(3), 28-45.
- Brajkovic, L., & Helms, R. M. (2018). Mapping internationalization on US campuses. *International Higher Education*, (92), 11-13.

- Cortés, C. E. (1998). Global education and multicultural education: Toward a 21st century intersection. *Intersections: A Professional Development Project in Multicultural Education and Global Education, Asian and American Studies*, 114-133.
- Institute of International Education (2017). *Open Doors data*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/opensdoors>
- Institute of International Education (2017). *Underrepresented Students in US Study Abroad: Investigating impacts*. Retrieved from [iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Publications](http://iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Publications)
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America*, 5, 32.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association for American Colleges and Universities.
- Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. D. (2015). Predictors of study abroad intent, participation, and college outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 56(1), 29-56. doi:10.1007/s11162-014-9338-7
- Mobley, M., & Fleshler, D. (2015). Advancing diversity through CDO and SIO collaboration. *Insight to Diversity*, (6), 16-17.
- Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(1), 82-104.
- NAFSA. (2017). *NAFSA International Student Economic Value Tool*. Retrieved from [nafsa.org/Policy\\_and\\_Advocacy/Policy\\_Resources](http://nafsa.org/Policy_and_Advocacy/Policy_Resources)
- Redden, E. (2010). Academic outcomes of study abroad. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from [www.insidehighered.com](http://www.insidehighered.com)
- Salisbury, M. H., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. T. (2011). Why do all the study abroad students look alike? Applying an integrated student choice model to explore differences in the factors that influence white and minority students' intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education*, 52(2), 123-150. doi:10.1007/s11162-010-9191-2
- Sweeney, K. (2013). Inclusive excellence and underrepresentation of students of color in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 23, 1-21. Retrieved from: <https://frontiersjournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/SWEENEY-FrontiersXXIII-InclusiveExcellenceandUnderrepresentationofStudentsofColorinStudyAbroad.pdf>

## AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES



**KATI BELL** is the Senior International Officer at Dominican University of California. She has been an International Educator for over 18 years, working in universities in the U.S., Australia and Ukraine. Her experience includes: establishing international exchange programs, co-creating diversity improvement plans, leading campus internationalization committees, and developing student learning outcomes for global learning programs. Her current research interests focus on implementing and assessing internationalization policy that reflects achievable curricular goals and outcomes for both international and domestic students.



**WILLIAM B. HARVEY** has accumulated more than four decades in the academic and non-profit sectors and a broad range of experiences in those settings. A distinguished researcher and administrator, Harvey's scholarly activity has been focused on the cultural and social factors that affect underserved populations, with particular emphasis on college and university settings. The founding president of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education, he also served as the inaugural Chief Diversity Officer at the University of Virginia, and as Vice President and Director of the Center for Advancement of Race and Ethnic Equity at the American Council on Education.



**ANDREW GORDON** is a social entrepreneur and CEO and Founder of Diversity Abroad. With a passion for student success and international education Andrew founded Diversity Abroad in 2006 with a simple vision, that the next generation of young people from diverse and underrepresented backgrounds have the confidence, experience, and skills necessary for success in the 21st century global marketplace. As the chief national advocate for diversity, equity and inclusion within international education, Andrew speaks and writes extensively on such topics. He has consulted colleges & universities, non-profit and for-profit organizations, and government agencies on developing strategies for connecting ethnic and racial diverse, first generation and low income students to global learning opportunities. A native of San Diego, Andrew is fluent in Spanish and Portuguese and proficient in French. He is a graduate of the University of San Francisco and has studied, worked and traveled throughout Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, and the Middle East.



**JENNIFER DONAGHUE** serves as Director of the International Services Office at The George Washington University (GW). She studied and interned abroad in Spain, and taught English in Japan with the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program (JET) before coming to Washington, D.C. to pursue a graduate degree in International Affairs at American University. Jennifer is pursuing a doctorate degree in Higher Education Administration at GW University. Her research interests lie in access and outcomes of education abroad for students of color, and international student exchange as a scholar practitioner.



+1 510-982-0635 ext. 704  
members@diversityabroad.org  
[diversitynetwork.org](http://diversitynetwork.org)

Follow Us: @diversityabroad

